



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

countrymen; and let us consider what other reason can be given for it.

We have found, in the *Tablet* newspaper of the 31st of last July, a letter, written by a Roman Catholic missionary priest, employed among the Irish Roman Catholics in America, during those very twelve years of which Mr. Mullen speaks; and this missionary thus undertakes to account for it:—

"I declare it as my own experience of twelve years in the western missions, and I appeal for its truth to every missionary, of longer or shorter experience, the fact that apostasies from the faith of St. Patrick is owing, with scarcely an exception, to the want of religious instruction in which these unfortunate people were literally raised. . . . My humble advice, therefore, to those whom it may concern, IN IRELAND, is, teach all the children, and many, very many of the adults, the Christian doctrine."

We think this explanation is not far from the truth; but we do not think that it is the truth.

We never heard of a multitude of men changing their religion while they continued in stupid ignorance. It is when men's minds begin to work, that these things happen. When men attain to the first and hardest step in the path of knowledge—namely, the knowledge of their own ignorance—then they will take some active step in the search for truth. We met with a remarkable instance of this not long since. WE SAW an address, signed by 243 Roman Catholic heads of families, in a parish in the west of Ireland, and presented by them to the Protestant clergyman of that parish. We shall never forget the simple and forcible statement it contained—"We find that we have lived in ignorance, and that we are like to die in the same." And they asked him to build them a church, and to give them instruction. Their request was complied with, and they now learn from him the Word of God.

It was not their ignorance that led them to this, but the DISCOVERY they had made of their ignorance.

We have now shown, from unquestionable testimony, what is going on in Ireland and in America. In such a state of things discussion and inquiry is essential and inevitable. Our journal was established to afford a means of this discussion; and the manner in which Roman Catholic laymen have come forward for such discussion in our pages, is not the least remarkable sign of the times.

It has been our endeavour heretofore, and will be for the time to come, to conduct this discussion as sincere lovers of truth, and in a spirit of Christian love towards all our fellow-countrymen.

### THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Continued from page 69.)

OBJECTION 9.—Protestants, to justify their revolt from the old Church, affirm, that she had revolted from God, and that God Almighty had cast her off.

Their own Bible assures them that God Almighty has made a solemn oath, that this should never be (*Isaiah* liv. 9, 10)—As I have sworn, that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth; so I have sworn, that I would not be wroth with thee (the Church) nor rebuke thee. For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord, that hath mercy on thee. Where it is worthy our notice, that this whole chapter is acknowledged, by the contents prefixed to it in the Protestant Bible, to have been spoken of the Gentile Church, to which St. Paul himself applies the first verse of it—*Gal.* iv. 27.

OBJECTION 10.—Protestants, to justify their revolt from the Church, pretend that God Almighty's covenant of peace with his Church was not everlasting, and that he did not promise that his sanctuary should be in the midst of his Church for evermore.

Their Bible, in plain terms, contradicts both parts of this their assertion (*Ezek.* xxxvii. 26), where God Almighty, after having promised by his prophet the coming of Christ, and the establishment of his kingdom—that is, of his Church—tells us, Moreover I will make a COVENANT OF PEACE with them. It shall be an EVERLASTING COVENANT with them: And I will place

them, and multiply them, and will SET MY SANCTUARY IN THE MIDST OF THEM FOR EVERMORE.

REPLY TO 9 AND 10.—Protestants do not affirm these things. They hold that, though the Christian Church had fallen into grievous and damnable errors, it had never wholly revolted from God; nor do they believe that the Almighty had ever cast her off. On the contrary, they believe that God's Spirit never abandoned his Church, since the fundamental points of Christianity were maintained, and the means of knowing God's will were preserved among Christians. Otherwise, the Reformation—which was not any new revelation, but merely an assertion of the doctrine contained in the acknowledged Scriptures—could not have taken place. Just so God had not deserted the Church of Israel, amidst all its corruptions, as long as the means of salvation were preserved, and there was ever so obscure a remnant who used them. This abiding of God's Spirit, then, is the "covenant of peace" which he promised by his prophet to make with his Church—this is the "sanctuary" which he has set in the midst of them for evermore.

OBJECTION 11.—Protestants deny that Christ's Church upon earth is always visible; because they will have it, that for many ages, before their religion came in, there was no true visible Church upon earth.

Their Bible, in many places, expressly assures us, that Christ's Church is always visible; comparing it to a mountain upon the top of mountains, exposed to the view of all nations flowing unto it—*Is.* ii. 1, 2, 3, &c., and *Micah* iv. 1, 2. To a great mountain filling the whole earth.—*Dan.* ii. 35. To a city set on a hill which cannot be hid.—*St. Matt.* v. 14.

REPLY.—Protestants do not deny that Christ's Church is, and always has been visible (see reply 10), but they hold that this visible Church consists, and has always consisted, of various communities or churches, acknowledging one and the same invisible Governor, and called one in reference to him—the Lord Jesus Christ—whose "body," this collective assembly, is called in Scripture, and concerning which the prophet said—"All nations shall flow into it." And accordingly they find Paul addressing epistles to several distinct churches, without giving any hint of their being all subject to Rome. He says nothing of the kind, either in his Epistle to the Romans, or in his epistles to other churches. And the Apostle John, in the Book of Revelations, addresses seven churches in Asia as distinct communities, subject only to their Divine Master.

OBJECTION 12.—Protestants maintain, that the whole Church of Christ is not in one only society or religion; but that many different sects, divided from each other in faith and communion, may nevertheless all belong to the Church of Christ.

Their Bible plainly teaches the contrary, in which our Saviour tells us (*St. John* x. 16)—Other sheep I have which are not of this fold (viz., the Gentiles, who were then separated from the Jews), them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one FOLD and ONE SHEPHERD. And St. Paul (*Ephes.* iv. 4, 5)—There is ONE BODY, and ONE SPIRIT, as you are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, ONE FAITH, one baptism. Nor, indeed, is it possible, according to the Scripture, that the Church of Christ should subsist, if she were split into many sects, divided from each other in faith and communion: For every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand.—*Matt.* xii. 25.

REPLY.—Protestants do indeed maintain (see reply 11 and 7), that the Church of Christ is made up of different churches, divided in respect of ordinances, but united in all fundamental points of faith, and therefore belonging to the "one fold," under "one Shepherd"—Jesus Christ.

The quotation from *Matt.* xii. 25, 26, seems to have nothing at all to do with the subject of divisions in the Christian Church. It was an answer to those persons who were attributing the miracles of Christ—especially the casting out of devils—to Satan. If Satan allows his ministers (our Lord argued) to do the things belonging to the kingdom of God—"if Satan cast out Satan," he is divided against himself, "how shall then his kingdom stand?" for (v. 25) "every city or house divided against itself shall not stand."

(To be continued.)

### DR. MURRAY ON INFALLIBILITY.

(Continued from page 102.)

It may possibly appear somewhat startling to our readers, that so eminent a Roman Catholic theologian as the Professor of Theology at Maynooth, should have declared, in the passages we have quoted in *extenso* from his essay in another column, page 101, that watchfulness and prayer are the means, and the sole means, of "preserving the treasure of sound doctrine, when once possessed;" and consequently, that the silence of St. Paul, with respect to the existence of an infallible authority, as a preservative against the evils of heresy and apostasy, arose simply from the fact, that to have referred to an infallible authority, as a security against the evils described and apprehended by St. Paul, would

have been not only idle and impertinent, but actually pernicious.

"It is written," says Dr. M., "in the plainest characters, in every page of the Gospel, 'Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation.' This is one of the simple elements of Christian morals; no new appeal to infallible authority is necessary for Christian bishops to learn it. The danger to which they [i.e., those who already possessed the whole of sound doctrine in its purity] were to be exposed, was that of falling away from the truth—of losing the grace of faith; and that grace is to be preserved, like every other, by avoiding the occasion of sin, by watching and prayer, and pastoral supervision. These are the means established by God, and no other," therefore "it would have been idle and impertinent in St. Paul to have made any reference to a perpetual infallible tribunal, for recourse to a perpetual infallible tribunal is not the means, nor in any way a part of the means of overcoming the dangers in question"—pp. 37, 38.

With every word of this we can agree with Dr. M., and have no doubt but Archbishop Whately and all sound Protestant divines would do so too; and if this be sound Roman Catholic theology, and consistent with the doctrine of infallibility, as held by the Roman Catholic Church, we must admit that Archbishop Whately's argument from the silence of St. Paul is greatly (so far as it is designed against the Church of Rome) weakened, if not answered, by Dr. Murray's reasoning. It is, however, we think, something new to find an accredited teacher of the Church of Rome asserting that prayer and watchfulness are the means and the sole means of preserving and transmitting in their integrity the doctrines of religion, when once they have been delivered in their fulness; in other words, that, for the prevention and avoiding of heresy or schism, an appeal to a living infallible guide on earth is not only useless but injurious; the chief boast and pride of the Church of Rome having hitherto been that by its infallibility, and that alone, unity can be secured to the Church or schism prevented; and however the authorities of the Irish Roman Catholic Church may be induced to wink at Dr. Murray's argument, as a convenient mode of reply to a difficult Protestant objection, we are disposed to believe that the Roman Catholic Church will never consent, in real truth, to allow her members to treat her boasted infallible authority as superseded or needless, and to substitute for it the mere exercise of watchfulness and prayer (which every one can practise for himself); nor is it likely, we think, that the Roman Catholicity will consider that they derive much benefit or relief from risk and anxiety in following the teaching of an infallible guide, if they are once convinced by Dr. Murray that they must, after all, still rely exclusively upon watchfulness and prayer as the sole means of continuing in the true faith (just as if they were Protestants and had no such infallible guide to trust to as a preservative against error).

That Dr. Murray himself does not, however, feel quite sure of the Catholicity of such a doctrine, and is anxious to leave himself a loophole to escape by, if needful, is evident from the same page (38) of his essay, in which it will be observed that he defines the function of infallible authority to include preserving sound doctrine, as well as defining, proposing, and teaching it. These are his words—"The function of infallible authority, as such, is to preserve, define, propose, teach sound doctrine, and proscribe erroneous doctrine." To be consistent with his argument, his sentence ought to have run thus—"The function of infallible authority, as such, is not to preserve but to define, propose, teach," &c. The passage as it stands is, in fact, contradictory of his whole argument; for if one of the functions of an infallible authority, as such, be to preserve sound doctrine, recourse to it would at least be a part (and if so, surely a most important part) of the means of overcoming the danger of falling away from the truth, and losing the grace of faith, which Dr. Murray, in the very same page, expressly denies to be the case. Is it not, therefore, plain, that Dr. Murray is obliged either to exclude "preserving sound doctrine" from the functions of an infallible church, as he virtually does in this argument, or to admit that his reply to Archbishop Whately is wholly inconclusive and illogical? And before going further, we call on Dr. Murray to answer this plain question, suggested by his own inconsistent statements—does the function of an infallible authority, as such, include or exclude the preserving sound doctrine? And upon what authority does he so define it either in one way or the other? We confess, however, at the same time, that we do not see that Dr. Murray would get over the difficulty, even by correcting his definition, and excluding from it the word "preserving," for it is also part of his definition of the functions of infallible authority, as such, to "proscribe erroneous doctrine," and how it will be possible to hold that, while at the same time asserting that it is not any part of its functions to "preserve sound doctrine," and still more, how it can be part of its functions to "teach," and no part of its functions to "preserve" sound doctrine, exceeds our powers to conceive; and if there be any such infallible tribunal authorized to teach sound doctrine, and proscribe erroneous doctrine, such a tribu-